

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16 and 17 are rejected. Claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15 and 18-20 are objected to because these claims depend from claims that are rejected.

Claim Rejections

Independent Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto (U.S. 2004/0176148) in view of Ichihara (US6,275,699). Claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto in view of Ichihara further in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (APA).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection based on the arguments which follow.

Drawings

It is noted that no Patent Drawing Review (Form PTO-948) was received with the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant must assume that the drawings are acceptable as filed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for noting that claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15, and 18-20 would be allowable if written in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, Applicant believes that independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 (as well as their respective dependent claims) are also allowable based on the arguments which follow.

Arguments

Claim 1 is rejected by combining Morimoto and Ichihara under § 103(a). For comparing Claim 1 with Morimoto, the Examiner notes that "Morimoto ***fails to teach*** where the AFC controlling a local frequency signal; a memory unit for storing ***a plurality of AFC parameter sets, each AFC parameter set being corresponding***

to a base station within the wireless cellular system and the control module fetches the AFC parameter set, which corresponds to the second base station, from the memory unit and applies the fetched AFC parameter set, which corresponds to the second base station, to the automatic frequency controller to shift the frequency of the local frequency signal" (emphasis added). These features recited in Claim 1, however, are not disclosed or taught in Ichihara.

Ichihara discloses an AFC speeding mechanism, but the AFC speeding mechanism is quite different from that recited in Claim 1. In Col. 1, lines 10-13 of Ichihara, it is clearly stated that the AFC speeding mechanism of Ichihara is used in a code division multiple access (CDMA) system. In a CDMA system, base stations share the same frequency segment and depend on spreading codes to identify each other. Therefore, an AFC for a mobile phone of a CDMA system switched among different base stations would not need a different AFC parameter set. Ichihara also discloses the design difficulty of employing AFC for a mobile phone in a CDMA system is "from a first problem that **the frequency error can be detected for the first time after** all of the complicated processing such as base station search, synchronization or spectrum de-spreading has been well performed" and "[I]n other words, the processing such as base station search, synchronization or spectrum de-spreading **must be well performed before frequency adjustment is conducted**" (Col. 2, lines 19-24, emphasis added). In this disclosure Ichihara teaches an AFC mechanism as shown in Figs. 2-4, which speeds AFC configuration when a mobile phone is powered on (see Col. 4, lines 6-15). That is, the AFC speeding mechanism in Ichihara is not taught as being used after the mobile phone is powered on.

In contrast, Claim 1 is directed toward GSM or other communication systems that use different frequency segments to distinguish different base stations. In practice, when a mobile phone is moved to a new cell, the mobile phone needs to switch its frequency to a new frequency segment consistent with a base station in the new cell. When this happens, the AFC in the mobile phone needs to function to ensure successful communication between the mobile phone and the base station. The AFC design techniques recited in Claim 1 ensures that the mobile

phone collects AFC parameters of the new cell even before the mobile phone is moved into the new cell.

The Examiner has cited APA as teaching an automatic frequency controller and a frequency generator. Applicant does not acquiesce to this characterization and notes that, in any event, APA does not supply the above noted deficiency in the combination of Morimoto and Ichihara.

In summary, Ichihara does not teach "a memory unit for storing ***a plurality of AFC parameter sets, each AFC parameter set being corresponding to a base station*** within the wireless cellular system and the control module fetches the AFC parameter set, which corresponds to the second base station, from the memory unit and applies the fetched AFC parameter set, which corresponds to the second base station, to the automatic frequency controller to shift the frequency of the local frequency signal," which is recited in Claim 1 and not taught in Morimoto, either. Accordingly, even the combination of Morimoto and Ichihara does not render Claim 1 obvious, particularly when Ichihara is configured to operate in a different environment than Claim 1.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection be withdrawn and that Claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 2-5 are dependent claims that depend upon independent Claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons above regarding Claim 1 as well as the additional features recited in these claims.

Other independent Claims 6, 11 and 16 also includes limitations of collecting more than an AFC parameter sets corresponding to more than two base stations and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above regarding Claim 1, as well as the additionally recited features found therein.

Claims 7-10, 12-15 and 17-20 are dependent claims that depend upon independent Claims 6, 11 and 16 respectively and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above regarding independent Claim 1 as well the additionally recited features found in these claims.


Summary

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 13, 2006

By:


Demian K. Jackson
Reg. No. 57,551

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 40144